



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,884	06/24/2003	Guillermo R. Villalobos	NC 84,352	5995

26384 7590 11/01/2004

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL (PATENTS)
CODE 1008.2
4555 OVERLOOK AVENUE, S.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20375-5320

EXAMINER

XU, LING X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1775

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/601,884

Applicant(s)

VILLALOBOS ET AL.

Examiner

Ling X. Xu

Art Unit

1775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/7/2004.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5, drawn to a product, classified in class 428, subclass 701.
- II. Claims 6-18, drawn to a method, classified in class 427, subclass 314.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by other and materially different product such as sintering and densifying spinel powder using Hot Isostatic Pressing procedure.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. George A. Kap on 9/10/2004, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-5. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 6-18 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2-3 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 1 recites that the product is transparent to light and is devoid of grains of exaggerated size. The term "transparent" is not defined in claim 1 and may be interpreted as transparency being more than 50%. Claim 3 recites that the transparency being in excess of 50%, which do not further limit the transparency recited in claim 1. Also, the term "devoid of grains of exaggerated size" is not defined in claim 1 and may be interpreted as being less than 200% of the average sized grain. Claims 2-3 recite that the grains are less than about 300% of the average-sized grain, which do not further limit the grains size recited in claim 1.
3. There is an extra claim 2 present between claim 3 and 4, which should be deleted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the term “transparent” is a relative term. The term is not defined by the claim. It is unclear if the term “transparent” in claim 1 is referred to having transparency at least 50% or having transparency of 100%. Also, the term “devoid of grains of exaggerated size” is a relative term and is not defined in claim 1. It is unclear if the term “exaggerated size” is referred to more than 300% or more than 100%-200% of the average sized grain.

The term “average-sized grain” in claims 2-3 is also a relative term. The term is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It is unclear what is the size of an “average-sized grain”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1775

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sellers et al. (US 3,768,990).

With respect to claims 1-3, Sellers discloses a product comprising a transparent sintered body. The transparent sintered body contains magnesia-alumina spinel having high transparency for a wide range of wavelengths from visible rays to infrared rays including the range of 0.4-7 (Col. 4, lines 1-10).

Sellers also discloses the magnesia-alumina spinel has extremely small particle size well under one micron (col. 2, lines 60-67). Accordingly, the spinel is devoid of grains larger than about 1mm and is devoid of grains of exaggerated sized.

Sellers further discloses that the sintering aid LiF powder is uniformly mixed in the fine spinel powder (col. 3, lines 1-35), which accelerate the densification of the shaped body and provides the sintered body with uniform properties. After the sintering process, the LiF sintering aid would vaporize. Accordingly, the final spinel product is considered essentially devoid of a sintering aid component.

With respect to claims 4-5, Sellers disclose that the spinel, which is considered to be a hard crystalline solid, made by a composition containing equal molar amounts of magnesium oxide and aluminum oxide (abstract). Spinel containing equal molar amounts of magnesium oxide and aluminum oxide has the formula of $MgAl_2O_4$.

Art Unit: 1775

Sellers also discloses that LiF function as a densification agent. High densification is important to the attainment of optimum transparency and the other physical characteristics desired (col. 3, lines 20-35). Therefore, the porosity of spinel is considered to be minimum (much less than 0.2%) or in the alternative, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the spinel as dense as possible in order to obtain an optimum transparency.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ling X. Xu whose telephone number is 571-272-1546. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30 Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah D. Jones can be reached on 571-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ling X. Xu
Examiner
Art Unit 1775